



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/581,447	04/12/2007	Christian Funke	2400/0450000/VLC	2172
26111	7590	06/17/2010	EXAMINER	
STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C. 1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			MAEWALL, SNIGDHA	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	1612			
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
06/17/2010	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/581,447	FUNKE ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Snigdha Maewall	1612

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 25 May 2010 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a)  The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 12-14.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: \_\_\_\_\_.

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: See Continuation Sheet.

/Snigdha Maewall/  
Examiner, Art Unit 1612

/Gollamudi S. Kishore/  
Primary Examiner, AU 1612

Continuation of 13. Other: Applicant argues that Lahm covers long list of potential mixing partners for anthranilic acid amides where as the instant claims are directed to narrow selection of synergistically effective compositions of anthranilic acid amides and four mixing partners only . Applicant then contends that Lahm does not teach synergistic composition of I-a-4 and at least one anthranilamide of formula (II-I). Applicant contends that no ratio has been cited in prior art for compounds and also the rejection is based on impermissible hindsight. Applicants arguments are not persuasive. First applicants arguments are not persuasive with respect to the declaration provided to show synergism within the claimed compounds as insecticides because although the declaration provides unexpected results in terms of showing synergism in controlling animal pests with the combination of the claimed compounds, the unexpected results do not commensurate with the scope of the claims recited. Instant claim 12 does not recite any ratio and claim 13 recites very broad range for which there is not sufficient support for the broadest and the smallest range of ratio claimed between compounds of formula (I-a-4 or buprofezin, flonicamid, pirimicarb and anthranilamides of formula (II-I)). Applicant is advised to amend the claims to reflect the ratios of the compounds for which synergistic results have been presented commensurate with the unexpected results provided in the declaration. The declaration is insufficient in providing synergistic unexpected results for insect control shown for the claimed compounds in its full scope. More scientific and substantial data is required to be presented for the broad ratio of 500:1 claimed or the lowest range claimed.

Additionally, in response to applicants arguments that there was no motivation to mix any combination of compounds out of many from the prior art, the examiner repeats that "[w]hen a patent simply arranges old elements with each performing the same function it had been known to perform and yields no more than one would expect from such an arrangement, the combination is obvious". KSR v. Teleflex, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1740 (2007)(quoting Sakraida v. A.G. Pro, 425 U.S. 273, 282 (1976)). "[W]hen the question is whether a patent claiming the combination of elements of prior art is obvious", the relevant question is "whether the improvement is more than the predictable use of prior art elements according to their established functions." (Ida). Addressing the issue of obviousness, the Supreme Court noted that the analysis under 35 USC 103 "need not seek out precise teachings directed to the specific subject matter of the challenged claim, for a court can take account of the inferences and creative steps that a person of ordinary skill in the art would employ." KSR v. Teleflex, 127 S.Ct. 1727, 1741 (2007). The Court emphasized that "[a] person of ordinary skill is... a person of ordinary creativity, not an automaton." Idem at 1742.

Consistent with this reasoning, it would have been obvious to have selected various combinations of various disclosed ingredients (various insecticidal active compounds such as buprofezin, flonicamid and primicarb) from within a prior art disclosure, to arrive at compositions "yielding no more than one would expect from such an arrangement". According to declaration the specific combination of compounds of claimed formula show synergistic results with specific ratio such as 1:25 or 1:1 or 1:625, no results have been shown for the broadly claimed ratio. In response to applicants assertion that Lahm does not show compound of formula I-a-4 at all, it is respectfully submitted that instant claim 12 provides combination of either compound of formula I-a-4 with anthranilamide or combination of (2-2), (2-6) or 2-7 with anthranilamide. Lahm makes obvious combination of anthranilamide with flonicamid, thus satisfies the claim limitations. In response to applicants assertions of the rejections based on impermissible hindsight, it is respectfully pointed out that any judgment on obviousness is in a sense necessarily a reconstruction based upon hindsight reasoning. But so long as it takes into account only knowledge which was within the level of ordinary skill at the time the claimed invention was made, and does not include knowledge gleaned only from the applicant's disclosure, such a reconstruction is proper. See *In re McLaughlin*, 443 F.2d 1392, 170 USPQ 209 (CCPA 1971).